

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Br.C. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,907	07/11/2003	Kazuhiko Mackawa	240186US0 CONT	2491
22850	7590 06/24/2005		EXAM	INER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			MULLIS, JEFPREY C	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1711	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/616,907	MAEKAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communi Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common if the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30.2) If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months at earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r junication. D) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thin atutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) file	d on 24 February 2005.					
·						
3)☐ Since this application is in condition if	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 8-13 and 27-36 is/are pendid 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8-13 and 27-36 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any object	* ' '	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including 11) The oath or declaration is objected to		•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
2. Certified copies of the priority of3. Copies of the certified copies of	documents have been received. documents have been received in A of the priority documents have been nal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
		,				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/616,907

Art Unit: 1711

All previous rejections and/or objections have been withdrawn in view of the certified translations submitted of applicants' priority documents submitted in the parent case.

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel,* 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum,* 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi,* 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman,* 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 8-13 and 27-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,451,901. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the patent and those of the application overlap and furthermore there would appear to be no difference between a product containing an aqueous dispersion or solution of vinyl polymer incorporated into an aqueous dispersion as recited by the instant claims and an aqueous dispersion containing an olefin polymer in that both products would comprise an aqueous dispersion of vinyl polymer.

The terminal disclaimer filed on 2-24-05 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US 6,610,774 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Application/Control Number: 10/616,907

Art Unit: 1711

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 8, 9 and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Maekawa et al (WO 01/07518

See the previous office action at the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3.

Applicant's arguments filed 2-24-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The requirements of a certified translation of applicants priority documents are satisfied based on applicants submission of a copy of the certification in the parent case that the English translations were correct.

Nonetheless, review of the parent translations indicate that the range endpoints "45" and "55" as recited in claim 8 of the present application are not supported and in fact all of applicants priority documents at paragraph 11 disclose ranges of 2-50 or 2-30.

The Examiner regrets the above new grounds of rejection.

This Office action is not being made FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Mullis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:30.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/616,907

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck, can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-0994.

J. Mullis:cdc

June 22, 2005

